



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In treating these subjects, Dr. Figgis gives us a conspectus not merely of the controversies in which the *Civitas Dei* played so important a part, but of the modern critical writings upon the book as well, the latter more temperate in tone than the polemics but hardly less diverse in their conclusions.

One quotation will serve to show the scope and content of these lectures: "The book has been treated as a philosophy of history finer than that of Hegel; and again as the herald of all that is significant in the 'Scienza Nuova' of Vico. Can such views be sustained? Or is it the case that St. Augustine had no notion of a philosophy of history, that his views are self-contradictory, and that only a few passages throw more than a faint light on it? That question will form the topic of the second lecture. Did St. Augustine teach that the State is the organization of sin, or did he believe in its God-given character, and desire its development? Did he teach the political supremacy of the hierarchy, and, by implication, that of the Pope and the Inquisition? Or was it of the Church as the *Communio sanctorum* that he was thinking? Does his doctrine of individual election reduce to ruins all ecclesiastical theory? These topics will occupy the third and fourth lectures. What was St. Augustine's influence on mediaeval life? Was there something almost like a 'reception' of Augustinianism followed by a repudiation at the Renaissance? Or was it that only slightly he affected political ideals in the Middle Ages? Some see the whole controversy between Popes and Emperors implicit in the 'De Civitate Dei.' Others would trace it to causes quite different. What real change came about at the Reformation? Did St. Augustine's social doctrine (apart from the theology of grace) lose all influence? Or did men retain unimpaired the idea of the *Civitas Dei*, as it had been developed? These questions will occupy the last two lectures."

C. H. McILWAIN.

Harvard University.

Les Idées Politiques en France au XVIII^e Siècle. By HENRI SÉE. (Paris: Libraire Hachette. 1920. Pp. 264.)

In this book a novel and interesting method is employed. It is not a general commentary on French political ideas of the eighteenth century, nor is it merely a compilation of readings from the writers of that period. It is a very ingeniously arranged collection of brief extracts from the eighteenth century writers, selected in such a way

as to develop and clarify the various streams of thought whose torrential confluence is seen in the French Revolution. A bare minimum of comment by the author, a mere occasional sentence or paragraph, suffices to preserve the continuity of the discourse. It is indeed a method which has been very successfully employed in biography but, so far as the reviewer is aware, has not hitherto been attempted in such a field as the history of ideas. The ideas of each writer or group of writers, and not any particular works are thus analyzed, the extracts being chosen from a wide field of literature. The author is thoroughly master of his subject and marshals his material in convincing fashion.

Four distinct schools appear in the review. All recognized the need of reform but interpreted this need differently and sought to achieve it by different means. The liberal school, which falls in the first half of the century, represented by Montesquieu, D'Argenson and Voltaire, was historical in method, looked to the English government as a model, or sought to build upon the historical institutions of France such as the *parlements*, and was moderate in aim and purpose. The democratic school, of which Rousseau, Diderot, Helvetius and Holbach are the chief exponents, applying *a priori* methods and relying upon pure reason for the construction of a perfected state, was doctrinaire and absolutely intolerant of existing institutions. Its doctrine of popular sovereignty implied democracy in government. The physiocrats, of whom Quesnay and Lemer cier de la Riviere are chiefly quoted, were absolute monarchists and, while urgent in their demands for reform, emphasized economic rather than purely political principles. The revolutionary school, of which Mably and Condorcet are examples, accepting the premises of their democratic predecessors, drew the ultimate conclusion of revolution as the necessary means for securing the establishment of the people's sovereignty.

The one idea which was shared by practically all the writers of the period was that of the rights of man, and this became the cardinal doctrine of the Revolution. The demand for a definite formulation of these rights precedent to the drafting of a constitution appears to have been well-nigh unanimous.

It was not to be expected that much new light could be shed upon a subject already so thoroughly investigated as the intellectual movement of the eighteenth century, but the method of presentation and the clarity and proportion of the treatment make this little book a very useful one.

WALTER JAMES SHEPARD.

University of Missouri.